Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
*Combined with the Magazine* ANALYSIS
*Editorial Office* 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VIII, NO. 32, *Issue Number* 393, AUGUST 8, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED AUG 15 '51 LIBRARY

# ARE YOU AN "ANTI-TAXATIONIST"?

By Frank Chodorov

The smear word is necessarily short-lived. Repetition dulls the keen edge of contumely, and the word loses its effectiveness. Therefore, those whose logic consists of calling names are in constant need of replacements. They are not lacking in ingenuity.

A new term has been tried out for opprobrium; it is "anti-taxationist". It emblazoned the literature of the "progressive" educators in a campaign to mulct the citizenry for an enlarged mind-control laboratory. It was applied, of course, to the selfish, hard-hearted opposition, those who put dollars above the welfare of the children. By direct statement, innuendo and inference, the "anti-taxationist" was left without a shred of decency, a pariah whose proper fate would be burning at the stake.

We can expect to hear more of this howitzer of reproach. There is an increasing antipathy toward the tax-collector in this country, and as this antipathy galvanizes into action it is quite likely the collectivists will make ample use of this weapon. For, as every disciple of the glorified State knows full well, taxation is the necessary means for advancing their holy cause; any diminution of the power to confiscate wealth is a threat to the realization of their Utopia. The "anti-taxationist" is a mortal enemy.

It is devoutly to be wished that the term gets liberal use, for this new invective is truly definitive; it makes a clear-cut and basic distinction between collectivist and individualist. A smear word that, no matter how you twist it, continues to carry its weight in meaning is one the smearer is entitled to and the smeared can have no objection to.

The "anti-taxationist", whether he knows it or not, is one who puts his faith in the principle of private property, while his opposite would destroy that principle and vest all ownership in the State. There is no way of distorting the hyphenated term so that it will lose this essential meaning. Unlike epithets of indefinite content -- like fascist, plutocrat, reactionary, economic royalist -- the word "anti-taxationist" does not lend itself to promiscuity.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the "anti-taxationist" took time out to think about it, he would learn that in opposing taxation he is really putting up a fight for freedom. For, the very essence of freedom is the right of property, while taxation questions that right. The slave was a slave only because the law denied him any claim to what he produced; since he could not own, he was legally not a person, but approximated one of the animate things in the barn. The privilege of being master consisted in the legal right of confiscation. If the State has that right, is it not also master? In point of fact, as the State acquires more and more of our property, through taxation, are we not compelled by the exigencies of life to become its subjects?

In the final analysis, the "anti-taxationist" pays service, consciously or instinctively, to the Judeo-Christian doctrine of human dignity. The ownership of property does not make the man, but the right of ownership does. Were heavyweight champion Joe Walcott a Roman gladiator, fighting for no compensation but the applause of the crowd and the good will of Ceasar, he might be of a skill equal to that of the contractual prize fighter. Would he be the same man? The sense of self-respect, which is the glory of living, is heightened by the right of ownership.

II

Yes, the "anti-taxationist" should be proud to be so called, and should turn the intended slur to his advantage, as did the violators of the prohibition laws who were called "scofflaws". It got so, during prohibition days, that those who patronized bootleggers and speakeasies would refer to themselves, in semi-humorous fashion, by this derisive name; thus they indicated their conviction that the law was an invasion of one's private life, and to be a violator of it was an assertion of one's self-respect. The "scofflaw" considered himself a citizen of distinction; so should the "anti-taxationist".

There are, however, different degrees of "anti-taxationism". We cannot accord the same accolade to the surreptitious evader as we do to the open defiant. It is a reasonable inference, man being what he is, that the dyed-in-the-wool collectivist is just as quick to cheat on his income tax report as is the exponent of free enterprise. There is no honor in that. But, we must take our hats off to the ladies of Marshall, Texas, who stood up to the Federal Government and refused to collect taxes from their servants. And we instinctively pay our respects to Vivien Kellems, who defied the Government to indict her for not complying with the payroll tax laws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Praiseworthy as are these sporadic and grassroots rebellions, they can only serve as feeders for the mass revolution that is gradually taking shape. For several years, there has been developing a movement to limit the levy on incomes to twenty-five per cent. The strategy has been to pressure state legislatures into memorializing Congress, for the purpose of calling a national convention to consider such an amendment to the Constitution; if two-thirds of the state legislatures agree, the convention must be held; to date, 22 have passed the memorializing resolution. In the meantime, Representatives Ralph Gwinn of New York and Noah Mason of Illinois, have introduced tax-limitation resolutions in Congress. In short, there is a fermentation in our body politic that could break out into the real thing, if the general disaffection with income taxes becomes more articulate.

One cannot help recalling, wistfully, that before the Sixteenth (income tax) Amendment was passed, it was proposed to limit the levy to -- ten per cent. This was opposed on the ground that a specified limitation would give the Government a goal to shoot at, and not even the proponents of the Amendment dreamed of a levy larger than two per cent; and, of course, only the incomes of the "bloated plutocrats" would be touched. Fifty years ago the faith of the American people in the integrity of the State was still naive.

III

Income taxation is, in principle, the worst of all forms of taxation. It is the denial of the right of property. All taxes are "compulsory dues and charges" levied by the State "upon its subjects"; but the nature of indirect taxes, the kind that are added to the price of commodities, carries the implication that the subject has a natural right to his property; the cost of government is the only argument for indirect taxes, and they are levied surreptitiously so as to ease the pain. Income taxation, on the other hand, begins by asserting the prior right of the State to all wealth; what the citizen may retain is a legal allowance. Under present law, the Government may confiscate the total income of all the people, "from whatever source derived".

Without income taxation Socialism is impossible; with it Socialism is inevitable. The interventionist measures passed under the aegis of the New Deal and the Fair Deal -- transparent pseudonyms for Socialism -- would have been impossible without the broad confiscatory powers of the Sixteenth Amendment. But for this measure, Washington would still be the interesting debating society it always was, and the country would not be burdened with millions of time-serving interventionists and ob-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

structionists. It was the Sixteenth Amendment that destroyed the Union, made a shambles of representative government and put us on the high road to Statism.

Only the repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment could give us back the freedom we have lost since World War I, and restore the necessary social power to try for more.

So reasons the intransigent idealist. The proposed twenty-five per cent limitation is hardly to his liking. It is a compromise with principle. Every compromise is necessarily full of loopholes, and the amendment proposed is no exception; even a cursory reading of it suggests how the Government could circumvent the limitation. For one thing, the limitation is suspended during war, and we know how simple it is to keep us in a constant state of war.

However, the American "way of life" has become so inextricably involved with the income tax that its termination would have the same effect on our economy as the sudden stoppage of narcotics has on the health of an addict. The value of the Government bonds foisted on us would evaporate; our forced investment in "social security" would be lost; businesses which live only by virtue of subsidies and Government contracts would collapse; the valid, though unfortunate, obligation to veterans could not be met. It is not difficult to see that chaos would result from outright repeal, and though the chaos would in the long run profit the country, the immediate circumstances would be hard to take.

Hence, the proposed compromise, despite its defects, commends itself to the "anti-taxationist"; even if it is not a cure, it is a relief. Certainly, the tendency of the State to expand its functions and to invade further into the life of society would be retarded. It commends itself also because it represents a frontal and fundamental attack on Statism. It aims to check the State in its relentless purpose of destroying our freedom by sapping its strength. This is not a reform measure, it is a revolution.

IV

It is not the policy of HUMAN EVENTS to endorse specific organizations -- we are arch-individualists -- but in this instance we see good reasons for breaking a fixed rule. We urge our readers to learn from the Committee for Constitutional Government, 205 East 42nd Street, New York, how the tax-limitation effort is going, and what a full-blooded "anti-taxationist" can do to further it.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII No. 31 August 8, 1951

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED AUG 15 '51 LIBRARY

By Frank C. Hanighen

WORDS OVER KOREA: How long will the cease-fire talks between Soviet puppet emissaries and American officers go on? After a month of wrangling, with no cease-fire or real truce in sight, this question is forcing its way to the top of the forum of American public opinion. Since the fighting still goes on, with its dismal weekly casualty toll, mothers and fathers want acutely and agonizingly to know -- when?

We sought out a very anonymous expert on the Far East -- one of those civil servants whose advice on China and Korea was disregarded when he tried to prevent the present mess; and who sits in a remote Government bureau trying to find some hope in the dispatches, as he seeks to square headlines with his background knowledge of the Far East for the past quarter-century. His reply was, as follows:

"These talks might run many months, maybe a year. You seem surprised? Well, I want to remind you that this is an old game of the Chinese Communists. It's a matter of history. They carried on quite a number of cease-fire talks with Chiang Kai-shek, and some of them lasted a very long time. For instance, one of these parleys commenced in February, 1944 and did not end until May, 1945. These particular talks were held in Chungking and Sian, for approximately sixteen months.

"As a matter of fact, this protracted negotiation followed a short period of all-out warfare which in turn had been preceded by a previous cease-fire negotiation. The latter had lasted several months and ended only in November, 1943. During the talks, intermittent, although not all-out, war went on. Why did the Reds string out these parleys? Simply in order to build up their forces for another assault on Nationalist China. In my opinion, the Reds are pursuing the same strategy today in Kaesong. And if they do come to an agreement soon, they will certainly violate it."

* * * * *

FLOOD CONTROL: Truman, not surprisingly, plays Pendergast politics with human misery along the banks of the Missouri. He has called for elections of "Liberals" to Congress -- as the solution of the flood control problem. "Liberals" -- the argument ran -- would vote funds for river work as "reactionaries" have failed to do.

Senator Kem of Missouri, who knows a good deal about the problem, fired back. We 'phoned him and he said, "The President has forgotten his own shortsighted record on flood control. His own Bureau of the Budget reduced the Army Engineers' request for funds for river and harbor and flood control work, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, in the amount of $344 million. Also, the President on August 2, 1946 (plenty of time in advance to take care of the disaster of this month) issued an order curtailing expenditures for river and harbor and flood control work for the fical year 1947. This order resulted in reduction of over $300 million of the sum which Congress had appropriated." This record is the effective answer to the President's political remarks on flood control.

* * * * *

ACHESON STILL OVER SPAIN: When the military finally overrode the State Department opposition and achieved a deal with Spain, the general opinion here was that State would swallow its disappointment and collaborate in making Spain a real military bastion of defense. Like many other general opinions, this one has now proved faulty, although the real news has not yet reached the public prints.

Dean Acheson -- who in 1946, together with the Red Dean of Canterbury, led a Communist-inspired rally against Franco Spain in Madison Square Garden -- is not so readily converted. We learn from unimpeachable sources that, on the morrow of Ad-

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miral Sherman's agreement with Franco, Acheson sent his aides to the Defense Department. Their "line" ran, as follows:

"Yes, we must make Spain a bastion of our defense. But, military aid cannot prove successful without economic aid -- to raise the standards of living of the people. That's our province. We propose that a State and ECA mission go to Madrid to examine and supervise thoroughly all economic aid expended in Spain."

This proposal, we hear, has aroused angry opposition -- and apprehension -- in the Pentagon. The Pentagon people fear that the State Department would utilize such a mission to create confusion, if not chaos, in Spain; by withholding funds from one faction and tendering them to a rival, thus playing one against another. State Department agents -- still trying to overthrow Franco -- would upset all the Defense Department's plans for a stable Spain, certainly a prime necessity for construction and operation of our bases there.

It might be added that these Pentagon fears are seeping into committees on Capitol Hill which are examining requests for foreign aid. The reaction of Congressmen is, "Let the generals and admirals supervise any money for Spain."

* * * * *

TYDINGSISM: Veteran observers here are aghast at Senator Benton's resolution to oust Senator McCarthy and at the Senate Committee report denouncing Senator Butler, to whose campaign for election last November McCarthy lent an oratorical hand. No one can believe the Senate would take seriously such a report or resolution. The history of abortive attempts to oust Members of Congress for one reason or another is a long and tiresome one. Therefore, veteran observers conclude, desperation must drive men near to madness, and the widening popularity of McCarthy has apparently produced -- among Fair Dealers such as Benton -- the reckless mood inspiring these moves.

Even the most absent-minded reader of newspapers must be struck by the irony of the whole affair. Tydings was defeated by Butler in the Maryland Senatorial contest, largely because many Marylanders felt he had failed to conduct his inquiry into Communists-in-Government with sufficient vigor. Whitewashing Communists is not popular, and so arose the term "Tydingsism".

McCarthy's charges have received powerful support in the past few weeks from hearings of the McCarran Internal Security Committee. General Barmine's testimony, for instance, indicated a rather proprietary attitude by Moscow towards a certain Owen Lattimore. The former Russian general was then (and is now) an employee of the Voice of America, a subdivision of the State Department. It would not have been an insuperable task to summon him to the Tydings Committee room a year ago, as he was summoned last week.

Any reader of newspapers must, after very little ratiocination, arrive at the conclusion that McCarthy and Butler are being verbally flayed for the sin of reminding the Maryland voters of Tydings' dereliction of duty.

* * * * *

ANTI-TAXATIONISM IN ACTION: Congressman Howard Buffett is busy these days answering mail from Texas housewives who applaud his recently offered bill to repeal the withholding tax law. However, it was not the Nebraska legislator but a Connecticut lady, Miss Vivien Kellems, who started it all. Miss Kellems in 1949 declined to collect and remit withholding taxes of employees of her factory and went to court to assert her right not to be an involuntary Federal tax collector. So, last winter, when a group of housewives in Marshall, Texas, revolted against the requirement that they withhold taxes from their domestics, Miss Kellems did not exactly discourage her sisters down south.

The Texas ladies have not only signed petitions against the practice required by the Internal Revenue Bureau, but also raised such a row that they got the Texas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senate behind them. They refused on April 30 to remit the taxes then due and on August 1, under threat of seizure of their property by the Internal Revenue Bureau, they still held out. This week, the Bureau agents moved in and succeeded in taking some money from bank accounts of a few of the housewives; others foreseeing this move had removed their accounts from their banks. The next move is up to the Bureau.

The mood -- significantly abroad in the land today -- which has helped feed the Texas revolt may well have affected the egregious Senator Connally, traditionally devoted to foreign boondoggling, to break out in his bitter attack on foreign spending last week. The Senator has heard from the rebellious ladies and so has the Representative from their district, the Hon. Wright Patman. The ladies' letter to Patman, who is chronically worried about Big Business instead of Big Government, was not kind. "You have been so busy deriding and insulting General MacArthur", they wrote, "you have not had time to study the Constitution. We have lost faith . . . in your wishes to conscientiously represent your district."

Note the reference to the Constitution. The ladies obviously want a battle royal in the courts on the matter for they insist in their petition on the unconstitutionality of the withholding law. "If we are to collect taxes," says the petition, "then we become servants or employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Thirteenth Amendment (it has been our understanding) forbids slavery or involuntary servitude. And we understand 'involuntary servitude' means 'forcing' an individual to work for or serve another. Therefore you would force us to violate the Constitution; this we cannot conscientiously do."

* * * * *

THOUGHT CONTROL: We single out for special praise a study of Administration propaganda techniques, written by Myrtle Ferguson, wife of the senior Senator from Michigan. It appears in the Washington news letter published by the National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs. Mrs. Ferguson lists seven steps which the Administration uses to "condition" the public to ideas that it wants to put across. (This column has often described various of these techniques of Administration "thought control".) Mrs. Ferguson does an admirable job of describing a process which -- she reminds us -- is performed by Administration publicity men whom our taxes support in their endeavors. Write for this piece in the No. 47 issue of the news letter, dated July 30, 1951, and published at the Republican National Headquarters, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

* * * * *

WEST POINT: We wonder as to the reaction of the proponents of "progressive" education to the firing of the West Point cadets accused of cheating. They should be upset over the news. To begin with, these advanced pedagogs are dead set against competitive examinations, on the ground that those who fail are likely to develop "damaged" personalities. Consistency would require them to indict the system that expects our future generals to measure up to certain standards, both as to mental equipment and discipline, since such a system is bound to cause frustrations among the rejects. The pedagogs would maintain that if there were no examinations there would be no cheating. Quite true. And since there would be no failures, all our lieutenants, destined ultimately to become generals, would be sound psychologically, even if they were somewhat deficient in gunnery and leadership.

* * * * *

MUNDT PLAN: Just the other day, a Republican member of the Lower House remarked -- in our startled hearing -- that he would enthusiastically support an anti-Administration ticket in 1952 composed of Byrd and Dirksen -- the Virginia Democrat for President, the Illinois Republican for Vice President. This statement, entirely genuine and sincere in our opinion, offers a measurable evidence of the progress of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Mundt's campaign for a "realignment of parties", for an "alliance" or "coalition" between the GOP Conservatives and Southern Democrats.

On investigation, we find that a considerable number of GOP Members of Congress in the area between the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachians talk much the same way; less definitely than the member aforesaid, less emphatically, but with a candor that would have been truly flabbergasting six months ago. Privately, these legislators advocate "realignment", although at the same time expressing doubt about the possibilities of such plans. But, as time passes, their emphasis changes: an increasing number stress the necessity of such schemes, while assigning less importance to the difficulties.

This trend towards considering the obstacles less insuperable has been hastened by Senator Mundt's interview in the August 3 issue of U.S. News. We believe that this magazine feature has had its greatest effect on "specialists" -- on politicos, publicists and air commentators. (After all, these are the "opinion formers" who in turn shape the attitude of the masses.) We found one GOP politician who said some of his own objections were convincingly answered by Mundt.

We are inclined to perceive great potential vitality in the "realignment" movement, for the simple reason that the rapid spread of the Mundt gospel has -- so far as we know -- been achieved by the Senator's exertions alone, without any well-financed public relations counsel or firm. Usually in the case of such crusades, smart boys in the publicity game get articles "placed" in magazines and newspapers, inspire radio chains to stage interviews and speeches, etc. etc. In this case, national magazines and radio commentators seem to have gone to Mundt out of pure news-hunting enterprise. A recent article in Colliers by the Senator, the cover portrait and interview in the U.S. News, various appearances on "forums of the air" and now the prospect of a piece in the Readers Digest -- these offer testimony to the vitality of the realignment project.

* * * * *

THE BOOK FRONT: With the success of Freda Utley's best-seller, The China Story, as an encouragement, various authors and publishers are working on books which deal with Administration foreign policy and Communism. A new book by John T. Flynn will be published by Devin-Adair this fall and will describe our debacle in Asia. Also, it is rumored that the same firm will put out a spectacular exposé of how Messrs. Roosevelt and Hopkins provided Soviet Russia with atomic secrets. The author is Major Racey Jordan, who testified on this theme before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1949. Richard Stokes (formerly of the St. Louis Post Dispatch) is said to have collaborated with Jordan.

We also learn that Professor Louis Budenz has a manuscript, another batch of revelations of Communists in Government. Budenz, formerly Editor of the Daily Worker, has frequently testified before committees on Capitol Hill with a particularly original thesis. He is now teaching at Fordham. Mr. Leigh White of the Saturday Evening Post staff is hard at work on a book with Mr. Robert Vogeler, detailing the latter's fearsome experiences at the hands of the Communist secret police in Hungary. White is undeterred by the hatchet job done by reviewers on his last book, Balkan Caesar, a highly critical study of the career of the State Department favorite, Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. (See this column, May 30, 1951.)

It has got about that Whittaker Chambers is now making rapid progress on his book which will appear serially in the Saturday Evening Post. According to some sources, Chambers will not neglect the career of Hiss after the famous break between the two men. What Chambers says about this may serve to settle the dispute as to whether Hiss continued pro-Soviet activities after the year 1938. It was in that year, according to the trial testimony, that the State Department official passed documents to the Soviet military intelligence apparatus.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED